DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 095 757 HE 005 830

AUTHOR	Dwyer, Claudette, Ed.; Patterson, Lewis D., Ed.
TITLE	Institutional Interface: Making the Right Connection. Trends and Issues in Cooperation, Spring 1974.
INSTITUTION	American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	74
NOTE	48p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Cooperative Program Publications, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D.C. 20036 ($4.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC Not Available from EDRS. PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Consortia; *Educational Administration; *Educational Finance; Essays; *Higher Education; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; Library Cooperation; Management

ABSTRACT

Six papers are presented concerning the trends and issues in interinstitutional cooperation. Topics cover national cooperative trends, case study in starting a consortium; consortia and institutional change, library networks and what to expect, higher education management, financing higher education in Pennsylvania, and making more states more responsive to postsecondary education. (MJM)

ED 095757

INSTITUTIONAL INTERFACE: Making the Right Connection

Trends and Issues in Cooperation, Spring 1974

Edited by
Claudette Dwyer, Executive Director
West Suburban Intercollegiate Council
and
Lewis D. Patterson, Coordinator
AAHE Cooperative Program

© 1974

ONE DUPONT CIRCLE
SUITE 780
WASHINGTON DC 20036
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION: NATIONAL COOPERATIVE TRENDS/
Lewis D. Patterson/1

STARTING A CONSORTIUM: A CASE STUDY/
Robert M. O'Neil/5

CONSORTIA AND INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE/
Fritz H. Grupe/12

LIBRARY NETWORKS: WHAT TO EXPECT/
Frederick G. Kilgour/22

HIGHER EDUCATION MANAGEMENT: AN OPPORTUNITY FOR CONSORTIA/Donald Shaner/29

FINANCING HIGHER EDUCATION IN PENNSYLVANIA/
J. G. K. Miller/36

MAKING STATES MORE RESPONSIVE TO POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION/Richard M. Millard/39

INTRODUCTION: NATIONAL COOPERATIVE TRENDS

Lewis D. Patterson

From a national perspective, there is some good news and some bad news for the cooperative movement. I'll give you the bad news first.

The number of national higher education organizations that are beginning to show an interest in furthering the voluntary cooperative approach is growing. This would be encouraging except for the fact that these associations seem to be giving more lip service than hard dollars and person power to the concept of cooperation. They are quicker to advocate improved relationships among their constituents than they are to practice what they preach with other organizations at the national level.

There are two areas where this approach is particularly wasteful. One is the scheduling of meetings, conferences, workshops and seminars at the local, state, regional and national levels. More and more organizations are scheduling such events with little or no knowledge of what others are doing calendar-wise or subject-wise. The second area is publications. While the volume of printed materials is increasing, there is a vacuum in the planning and coordination of these materials.

These and other wasteful practices would bother me less if the associations operated as proprietary agencies in an open marketplace but that isn't the case. Consequently, they are consuming portions of the very limited resources for postsecondary education available from public and private sources. The government agencies and foundations that condone these extravagances are not without fault either.

The National Center for Higher Education in Washington, D. C., might better serve postsecondary education if it were reorganized as the National "Consortium" for Higher Education and if it reached out to embrace other equally legitimate p.s.e. organizations in other locations. In any case, closer cooperation among national organizations will be precipitated by external pressures over the next two to three years.

There is good news on several fronts though the optimism is tempered most often by limited budgets. Linkage systems of varied

sorts are gradually gaining respectability but the financial support for these systems continues to be modest and guarded. At the federal level, Title III of the Higher Education Act is faring quite well under the present administration. The appropriation requested for 1975 will be $120 million, but it is available only to a limited sector within the higher education community. Further, the increased appropriations are geared more to strengthening the individual viability of developing institutions than to building permanent bonds among groups of institutions.

The Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education is another federal program that offers modest assistance to selected cooperative arrangements. But the trend of the past five years has been a shifting of leadership responsibility in postsecondary education from the federal back to the state level. This trend is likely to continue for at least the next three years.

One indication of this shift of responsibility back to the states occurred earlier this year. On March 1, 1974, Commissioner of Education John Ottina lifted the one-year suspension of federal action on the 1202 state planning commissions. One million dollars already appropriated was reserved for those states which were willing to establish 1202 agencies that are representative of public, private and proprietary education. Though the amount of money is relatively small, the long-range implications of the action are significant. The states clearly will play an increasingly important role in the coordination of higher education. Another indication of the growing power of state coordinating agencies is the recently announced Kellogg grant of nearly $600,000 to the Education Commission of the States and the State Higher Education Executive Officers for a program to strengthen personnel within state agencies over the next four years.

These new forms of cooperation by new kinds of organizations provide one of the strongest defenses of traditional consortia. Their successful approach has been transplanted to new ground and is beginning to take root, strengthening the cooperative movement as a whole. In addition, for the past several years there has been a steady growth in the number of formal, multi-purpose consortia that meet the five criteria I established seven years ago for the *Consortium Directory* listing. In the past twelve months the number has pretty much leveled off and stabilized at 80. A few new ones have appeared but an equal number have dropped out. Now, junior and community colleges, which comprised a very small percentage of the membership in consortia four years ago, are beginning to take the

initiative in new cooperative arrangements. Among them are the community colleges without walls in Newark and Maine and the private/public experiment of Rio Grande in Ohio. Another is the Montcalm Community College prison extension program in Michigan. One of the stronger advocacy positions for consortia yet set forth by a national organization is contained in the 1973 *Annual Report* of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Cooperative efforts are also prospering in the areas of continuing, extension and vocational education. Military programs such as the Community College of the Air Force, Eagle University and the Servicemen's Opportunity College, as well as state regional groupings too numerous to mention here, indicate the breadth of cooperation.

Major media have been taking note of consortia lately. The Newhouse News Service syndicated an article on consortia around the country a few months ago. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* reported on the Union of Independent Colleges of Art, listed 80 consortia in its "Fact File" and is planning a "Special Report" for future publication. For the first time, the *USOE Higher Education Directory* (1973-74) lists 80 consortia as Appendix G. Franklin Patterson's *Colleges in Consort* has been published by Jossey-Bass and is being widely distributed. The Center for Research and Development at the University of California at Berkeley and other centers are developing plans to research consortia. AAHE, in cooperation with the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, recently published a Title III developing institutions study by Harold Hodgkinson of the Berkeley Center. This "second wave" of media coverage is another sign of the success of the consortium movement. No longer are consortia being reported as educational curiosities with a wait-and-see attitude, but rather as established forces on the higher education scene.

In keeping with the expansion of the cooperative movement nationwide, the AAHE Cooperative Program has broadened its perspective without, in any sense, abandoning traditional consortia. A new publication, *Guide to Interinstitutional Arrangements: Voluntary and Statutory*, is attracting considerable attention. Tom Diener, Howard Johnston, Austin Conners and I assembled the data for the first edition knowing we had soft spots. We expect to have an expanded and much improved second edition in September 1974. Our other publications are on schedule and are reaching a larger group all the time. The program is well on its way to paying for itself. Less

than one year after beginning to charge for publications we have raised close to $8,000, compared with less than $4,000 received in contributions from 36 consortia, the Iowa Board of Regents and the University of Alabama's Institute for Higher Education. The semi-annual Cooperative Program Seminars will also continue to reflect the broader outlook of AAHE's program. Some who have attended a number of these seminars have suggested a return to the kind of meetings held in earlier years which were comprised mainly of consortium personnel. I believe that trying to turn back the calendar in this way would be harmful to consortia and to the cooperative movement as a whole.

The six papers in this book were selected from those presented at the Spring Cooperative Program Seminar held in Chicago last March. The variety of their approaches says better than I can that the cooperative movement is alive and well. They range from very specific studies with wider applications, such as Robert O'Neil's account of starting a consortium and Frederick Kilgour's description of the Ohio College Library Center, to generalized approaches with specific applications, such as Fritz Grupe's essay on consortia as change agents and Donald Shaner's paper on improving the management of higher education. While three of the papers deal directly with consortia, the other three reflect the cross-overs and blurring of boundaries between public and private, and voluntary and statutory arrangements now occuring in postsecondary education. J. G. K. Miller explains Pennsylvania's plan for financing higher education —a plan proposed and supported by the private and public sectors in that state. Dick Millard reports on three efforts by the Education Commission of the States (one, mentioned earlier, in cooperation with the State Higher Education Executive Officers) to improve states' responsiveness to postsecondary education needs. Finally, Donald Shaner's contribution presents a private management consultant firm's findings on public higher education management practices and suggests how these findings can be used by consortia and applied to private higher education.

All in all, a mixed bag. In fact, it seems to me that, taken as a whole, these essays show that the cooperative movement has changed from a rather narrowly defined phenomenon called a "consortium" to what could be considered an "approach" or "technique" for dealing with problems and changes in postsecondary education. They show that cooperation can take place anywhere there are people and organizations willing, quite simply, to cooperate.

STARTING A CONSORTIUM: A CASE STUDY

Robert M. O'Neil

I approach the topic of interinstitutional relations with the zeal of a convert. A bit over a year ago, I barely knew what a consortium was, much less where or what it did. Now, as a result of circumstances, I am deeply involved in several consortia.

To set the background, let me review our recent experience in forming a consortium in the Greater Cincinnati area. As metropolitan areas go, we are very late in getting started. Our sister cities of Dayton and Cleveland have sophisticated and well developed consortia, as do most other metropolitan areas of our size and character. Yet we have all the makings of a consortium, leading one to wonder why such an organization never existed before. In all there are twelve accredited institutions of higher learning ranging in size from the University of Cincinnati with 36,000 students to our tiny neighbor, Hebrew Union College. The group also includes a Catholic seminary, a graduate research center, a large public university (Miami), a medium-size public university (Northern Kentucky), a medium-size private university (Xavier), three private liberal arts colleges (Thomas More, Edgecliffe and Mt. St. Joseph), and the Cincinnati Technical College which is one of the largest of its kind in the state.

While we have had no formal organization until quite recently, relations among the area institutions have been unusually good. In fact, a number of specialized and bilateral arrangements already existed: between the University of Cincinnati and Xavier in the area of community health and hospital administration; between UC and Miami in graduate music, architecture and other programs; between the two Kentucky institutions in various fields; between the two public institutions within the city of Cincinnati (UC and the Technical College); and among the three smaller Catholic colleges, which have a common calendar with complete student cross-registration and which just last week announced a common tuition remission plan for all faculty children.

Robert M. O'Neil is executive vice president for academic affairs at the University of Cincinnati.

In addition to these relations, there are several specialized multi-institutional arrangements. We have recently formed a consortium of some 25 libraries—public and private independent libraries as well as all college and university collections. There is an evolving consortium among the summer schools in the area, with several joint programs. Perhaps most impressive, Cincinnati seems to be the only city in the country (out of some 200) to be offering on a consortium basis the current "course by newspaper." Several of the universities and colleges have collaborated closely with external agencies, notably the Chamber of Commerce, to present courses and symposia of local interest. These and many other ties already exist.

For all the evidence of interinstitutional cooperation, what we have lacked is any kind of general purpose consortium. Perhaps I should explain how we moved in that direction after so many years of disjointed, though benign, coexistence. One catalyst was the growing interest in special-purpose interinstitutional arrangements—the library group, the summer school consortium, the evening college and extension ties, the small business seminars, and others. We began to wonder whether it wouldn't make sense to get together for *all* purposes rather than simply on an *ad hoc basis.* Moreover, the success we had had in working together on particular projects encouraged us to think in broader terms and generated optimism about a multi-purpose consortium.

Second, we were undoubtedly influenced by the success of consortia elsewhere in the state. I have mentioned the envy with which we looked to the Dayton and Cleveland consortia. The Ohio College Library Center also served as a fine example of interinstitutional relations.

Third, while Ohio has one of the most loosely governed of all public university systems, we have had some gentle nudging toward cooperative arrangements by our Board of Regents. About a year ago, the Board refused to approve a master's degree proposal submitted by a state university which had not been discussed with a neighboring private university that already offered graduate work in the same field. Recently the Board urged three neighboring institutions—a large state university, a small private college and a vocational district—to work together toward creation of a new general and technical college. The rewards for collaboration may be more than psychic. The Ohio legislature has appropriated $1 million in 1974-75 for payments to private colleges and universities that teach courses to students from state universities. Apart from this modest

beginning—the only general program of even indirect support for the private sector—there is understandable concern about the plight of the private sector in a state which has the second largest number of non-tax-supported campuses in the country. Surely one response to that concern is to form a consortium in which eight of the twelve members are private, but to which the public institutions will pay the bulk of operating costs.

These three catalytic factors are rather special to the Cincinnati area. There are two others that presumably exist in every metropolitan area: the hope of reducing costs through economies of joint purchasing and the like, and the prospect of expanding educational opportunities for students at all member institutions. During the formative period of the consortium, we arranged meetings of the chief business officers to explore economic benefits and of the chief academic officers to consider curricular enrichment through cross-registration and other ways of sharing educational programs and resources. It is too early yet to tell what progress we will make in either area, though we are optimistic on the basis of our preliminary meetings.

Two special factors about the Cincinnati situation pose possible constraints. One is the dominant position of the two public universities. Miami and Cincinnati together account for about 80 percent of the students, with the other ten members dividing the remaining 20 percent. The next two institutions in size (one public, the other private) have another 10 percent of the students. This leaves the eight smallest institutions—two-thirds of the votes on the consortium board—with 10 percent of the students. Thus the flow of benefits may be skewed or, more accurately, the kinds of benefits realized by the larger institutions will be different from those realized by the smaller members.

The other special factor is the bi-state character of the metropolitan area. Although ten of the members are in Ohio, the Kentucky contingent includes a four-year, coeducational liberal arts college and a state college that is rapidly moving to university status with a law school and graduate programs in education. This unusual configuration seems generally beneficial, but there may be problems. The corporate consortium must register or qualify under the laws of both states. We sometimes forget to include our neighbors across the river, as in the evening newspaper course arrangement. Northern Kentucky is for some purposes (e.g., instructional television) tied more closely to Lexington or Louisville (90 miles away) than to

INSTITUTIONAL INTERFACE: Making the Right Connection

Trends and Issues in Cooperation, Spring 1974

ED 095757

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

American Association for Higher Education

$4.00

its nearby Ohio neighbors. When we come to cross-registration programs, we will undoubtedly encounter special problems if Miami students are deemed "residents" at Cincinnati but "nonresidents" at Northern Kentucky. (There was even a momentary threat that Kentucky might go one way on daylight saving time, while Ohio went the other. That crisis has passed, however, and at least the time is the same on both sides of the river.) We are most optimistic about the potential of such a bi-state consortium, but mindful of some special problems we may encounter. We hope to profit from the experiences of our colleagues in the Kansas City and Louisville consortia as we probe these issues.

This brief account indicates where we now are in Cincinnati and why we are trying to make up for lost time. There are a number of areas in which we see new potential through the consortium. (When I say "we" I am speaking for only one member of the consortium, albeit the largest. Technically, I can speak only for myself. But I suspect my views accord with those of academic administrators not only at our institution but at most of the other consortium member schools.)

First, we wonder how we might expand substantially the opportunities for student cross-registration options within the area. Such arrangements have already been developed by homogeneous twos and threes, so that UC students can take courses at Hebrew Union and Edgecliffe students at Thomas More. But there is presently no way in which Northern Kentucky students can sample advanced offerings in Judaics or Miami students can study Catholic philosophy. A consortium-wide system of cross-registration might permit such access. We realize this will require some accommodation of our presently very diverse calendars, and some monumental work on tuition and fee structures. But we believe if the will and the commitment exist, we have the technical capacity to carry out such desires.

Second, we might go beyond existing courses and programs and develop a procedure for comprehensive review of proposed new programs. Whether or not we can reduce the duplication and overlap that already exist, we may be able to check further proliferation of competing or conflicting programs and courses. Since our resources are so severely limited, the incentive to coordinate our offerings is powerful. In addition, the Ohio Board of Regents has already insisted on such coordination and clearance before they will approve

new graduate programs, and the logic of their mandate extends as well to the undergraduate level.

Third, we might fashion several shared academic programs to meet special needs of our area and our students. We have talked about borrowing a consortium program in Women's Studies from Pittsburgh, for example, or an urban studies option like the one we understand exists in Bridgeport and perhaps elsewhere. (Our few present joint programs involve only two or three institutions rather than the whole group. Perhaps the one broad step we have taken was the consortium of evening colleges which sponsors the newspaper course, but there the coordination was more procedural than substantive, and had no unique focus for the Cincinnati area.)

Fourth, we wonder if we could develop a regional media services sharing system, borrowing from what we understand exists in the North Texas gradaute consortium (TAGER). Our university already has two rather sophisticated media centers, one for the main campus and the other for the medical center including the affiliated hospitals. If we can bring these two units closer together we might then be able to offer services to and share resources with our sister institutions. Two years ago the University of Cincinnati's Computer Center became the Southwestern Ohio Regional Computing Center. Miami is a charter member, Xavier a growing user, the federal Environmental Research Center about to be tied in, and other institutions are prospective clients. If we can do this in the computer area, why not in media services?

Fifth, our consortium might provide the base population for a Health Maintenance Organization. In our own medical school we have the professional staff and most of the facilities necessary to a successful HMO but we lack the requisite population. If all or most of the other consortium members could add their staffs and perhaps some of their students, the concept would work. There would be some geographic problems, of course, since the UC medical center is not convenient to all the other campuses, but this barrier could be surmounted.

Sixth, we are looking at the prospects for joint academic appointments shared by two or more of the member institutions. We might launch this concept with the executive director of the consortium, who would be based at one campus but might belong to the faculties of at least two of the member schools. We have already found in several cases that sharing a specialized faculty member enabled us to offer courses and staff programs (in Judaic studies, community

health, architecture and modern foreign languages) we would otherwise have to forego. But our use of joint appointments has been very modest, inhibited by all the traditional reservations and misgivings.

Seventh, we hope the consortium might have an office or outpost near the center of Cincinnati to provide community outreach and contact for all the member institutions. There is an ideal site for such an outpost located near the heart of the oldest black community in the city. It is across the street from the Music Hall where symphony and opera regularly perform. A new vocational high school will be on the periphery, and Cincinnati's educational television station is moving there. There are many advantages to such an outpost location, but there are also problems, one of which is cost. We would welcome advice and counsel from other consortia that have established similar community offices.

Eighth, we hope the consortium may bring about better curricular planning and much closer communication than presently exists between scholars in many fields and disciplines. It is striking how little contact there has been over the years between mathematicans at Xavier and Miami, sociologists at Cincinnati and Northern Kentucky, philosophers at Hebrew Union and at Thomas More. We know that the mere formation of a consortium does not automatically achieve such goals. Indeed, faculty involvement will probably exist only to the extent that diligent efforts are made to promote it. Initially these interinstitutional contacts may be threatening to professors who have close ties with colleagues across the country but have never talked with their counterparts across town. We hope that the proper commitment from our presidents and sensitive leadership from the consortium staff can overcome distrust, fear and suspicion even at a time when some people may see in such contacts a devious way of reducing faculty positions.

Ninth, we understand there may be both state and federal funding for certain projects and activities on a multi-institutional basis. Our neighbors to the north have used the Dayton-Miami Valley Consortium to good advantage in several projects of vital importance to the metropolitan area for which a single college or university could not have gotten external support. We hope to profit from their experience even though outside funding will probably be progressively harder to attract, and consortia will be less novel and attractive.

Finally, in time we hope to create a comprehensive long range

plan for the member institutions. Each of us must first get our own houses in order, which we are attempting to do through internal campus planning. If each of us can develop an institutional plan for the next decade or so, it should be possible to begin regional higher education planning. In many states, such planning is either compelled or actually done by the state higher education board. Happily, the Ohio Regents have merely encouraged us to work together and have not mandated "regionalism" on the model of other states. Apparently they are looking to the metropolitan areas to see how well we can plan and cooperate on our own. So far they seem to like what they have seen in Dayton and Cleveland. When the Regents visited Cincinnati several weeks ago, they received favorably our first reports of the consortium even though we could not be very specific. They will presumably give us a chance to show that voluntary cooperation, involving all the public and private institutions of higher learning in the area, can succeed. If we fail, the Board of Regents may feel they have no alternative but to preempt the vacuum. Thus the incentives, apart from the more immediate ones I have mentioned, are quite substantial.

This listing of goals must seem quite naive and visionary to many who are veterans of the consortium world. What we need at this point is help from those who have already been the way we are starting to go. We are completely convinced that we are doing a right and necessary thing in forming the consortium. But there is much we do not know about the implications of our coming together in this way and of the goals we have set for ourselves. We welcome and will be seeking aid and counsel from our colleagues in regions where interinstitutional cooperation has much deeper roots.

CONSORTIA AND INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

Fritz H. Grupe

A need for interinstitutional cooperation among colleges and universities has been regularly expressed in general terms by college presidents, organizational theorists, reform educators, coordinating agency personnel and staff members of foundations and other project funding agencies. Despite these recurring appeals, cooperative linkages are not usually perceived as leading to the kind of educational changes the times require. In establishing legislative priorities, national policy priorities, or even institutional priorities, policy makers rarely consider consortia as a starting point for change.

Some critics feel that consortium programs are peripheral to the main elements of colleges and universities. This is often true. Academic consortia are mainly intended as means to carry out changes of interest on the part of member colleges. To a much lesser degree, consortia are expected to be the initiators of radical change not sought by the members. Indeed, it would be somewhat arrogant for consortium staff to feel that they are sufficiently competent to define, by themselves, the changes needed. Consortium staff are all well aware that, even while engaged in discussions about time-free and space-free learning, no one is yet talking about institutional-free learning. Thus, many ideas will not be explored by consortia, not because they aren't good, but because they don't work through the member colleges. I make this point because some criticisms of consortia are not legitimate since they imply a form of independent action that was not intended for the consortium—a form of action, in fact, which would be counterproductive.

Consortia have no inherent ability to elicit more creative educational changes than would normally emerge from colleges independently. Consortia are primarily organizational solutions to certain types of organizational problems. They are enabling innovations that permit other changes to occur. While their educational impact can be of great importance, consortia generally must operate on the assumption that college staff know what they are doing and why. Even

---

Fritz H. Grupe is executive director of the Associated Colleges of the St. Lawrence Valley.

if the establishment of clearer institutional goals is a major objective, the definition of that objective should originate on the campuses.

However, in spite of a rather obvious absence of conclusive evaluative measures, consortia really do make a contribution. Witness the general increase in their numbers, and their relatively high staying power. There are probably no other types of organizations that are as heavily involved in unbought, broad-scale interaction and cooperation on as many levels. A survey on one major university campus identified over 200 interrelationships, with other colleges, mental health centers, industrial organizations, and other formally organized groups. That is quite far from the image of the isolated campus that many people carry around with them. It is also an indication of the breadth of involvement any college can have in a variety of cooperative arrangements.

Yet the belief also persists that the consortium approach is a viable means of fostering change. It may be that consortia have not been overly productive in initiating "basic changes," whatever that term means, but until recently this was never expected of them by institutional staff, by funding agency personnel, or by planning agencies. The question should be asked: Can academic consortia be more effective in bringing about change *within* their members, as well as *among* them? Havelock[1], after an exhaustive review of the literature on change, synthesized a six-step process of successful change around which I have organized some observations on the assets consortium directors have at their disposal and the problems which need to be resolved if they are to be more effective.

Building a Relationship

Credibility is a precious commodity these days. The amount of authenticity, commitment and honesty in the relationships of people with other people, organizations with other organizations, and people with organizations affects the productivity of the relationships. The consortium relationship is no exception. The role of the consortium director develops as a conscious response to the requirements essential to building productive, healthy relationships. An ability to initiate this step of the change process should be, and generally is, the forte of the consortium.

Most consortia select their members and then determine substantive

---

1 Havelock, R. G., *A Guide to Innvoation in Education*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Center for Research on the Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, 1970, p. 10.

objectives. The formation of a consortium starts, therefore, with an untested belief that there is a common advantage to be realized. Agreements on a charter and by-laws may be the only common factors at first. But once the formalities of consorting are completed, new relationships begin to form. The simple act of forming a corporate body gives authority to meetings of other administrators, faculty and students. Committee meetings, task forces and study groups begin functioning on an implicit assumption that there either already is or should be a stronger relationship than had existed. This assumption may not last, but at least the initial forward momentum is there.

After a consortium has matured, other supportive features can emerge. Repetition of the name of the consortium and its association with specific programs and activities provide legitimacy and feasibility to other activities and programs. Actual rewards, such as the receipt of external funds, which are experienced by some segments of the consortium are felt at many levels.

The consortium director should be a focal point for the array of relationships that begin to emerge. The director's adaptation to the change-agent role is a primary determinant of a consortium's health and longevity. The director can be a catalyst and speed up reactions. However, he or she can also slow them down, just like a catalyst. Campus personnel are, at least initially, likely to think of the consortium in terms of their relationship to the director. The centrality of the director in the building of all relationships surfaces again and again in efforts to mold new combinations, initiate new ideas, hold together past agreements, and create an awareness of what has already been produced.

There are, of course, obstacles to building useful relationships which are generally known. But there is one obstacle that is not usually noted. Though the number of consortia is increasing, few faculty and administrators have had experience with them. Consequently, inter-consortium learning through staff mobility has rarely taken place. Each problem is treated, with some justification, *de novo*. In the beginning, more time may be spent finding out whether the word is pronounced "consorteeum" or "consorsheum" than in determining specific objectives. As the number of consortia increases, campus staff will begin to understand programs in effect elsewhere, and new relationships will develop faster.

This first step in the change process, building a relationship, is constantly in motion. It is fragile and, to some extent, artificial. But as the idea of relationship becomes more widely accepted, the con-

sortium can become a facilitator of change in the way Havelock described it. He found that the key characteristics of an effective change-agent/client relationship were reciprocity, openness, realistic expectations of reward, structure, equality of power, minimum threat, confrontation of differences, and involvement of all parties. These characteristics are found in successful consortia.

Diagnosing the Problem

Identifying problems for which a consortium solution is appropriate is laborious and often frustrating. The consortium's very creation generates a whole new set of problems, as faculty and administrators try to determine what their positions are in a wide range of interactions. It is often far easier for campus personnel not to ask certain questions than it is to deal with them. The fact that eight or ten people from different institutions are present in the same room at the same time can force issues they would prefer weren't brought up. Meetings may not always produce matings, but they do force discussion.

It is frequently assumed that the needs cooperation is supposed to deal with are quite obvious. In fact, there are sharp cleavages separating numerous interpretations of what is needed and who must change. The consortium director has his own, not necessarily correct, conclusions. Progress in defining problems is sporadic at best, and largely governed by situational alchemy rather than by analytical logic. Shakespeare provided the caution that consortia must live with:

> Oft expectation fails, and most oft there
> Where most it promises; and oft hits
> Where hope is coldest and despair most sits.[2]

Synthesizing a problem statement is an entrepreneurial effort of no small dimension. While difficult, it is also one of the key contributions that a formal consortium can make to cooperative change. It is frequently noted that cooperative programs of almost any type can be adopted, and occasionally are, without a formal structure. The fact is that in most situations these programs didn't develop and wouldn't have if a consortium had not existed.

A consortium director who can constantly refocus attempts to identify problems and find solutions is a major asset. It is important to recognize the reinforcing effect various discussions and project out-

---

2 Shakespeare, W., *All's Well That Ends Well.* Scene II, 145.

comes have on one another. Advances thought impractical one year become overdue the next. An off-hand witticism at one meeting may provide the basis for a major project at another meeting. Typically, a slow but perceptible increase appears in the efficiency and speed with which new, substantive ideas for action emerge and develop. Without a formally appointed director, the adoption of any program at all is more difficult.

As an institutionalized "stranger," a consortium director is uniquely able to influence and structure some of the environmental factors working on college systems. To the extent that systems change only in response to outside influences, the consortium can become a useful instrument for creating the discomfiture essential to a search for and eventual acceptance of change. One must recognize, however, that at best the consortium can exert some influence on a member college, while the member college exerts real power over the consortium.

A continuing consortium relationship is conducive to growing honesty and accuracy of problem statements among campuses. Highly sensitive problems such as negotiations, student recruitment, and tenure policies are now discussed more often with a full disclosure of information than was true even a few years ago. The consortium director can contribute a great deal to those exchanges by ensuring the confidentiality of data discussed, and by providing an external and independent, "friendly critic" point of view.

Acquiring Relevant Resources

Consortia are expected to acquire resources that are of use to their members without becoming their competitors. At the most evident level, special projects funded by outside sources represent a net gain for the participating colleges. With these projects, the consortium makes an unequivocable contribution to the combined educational goals sought. An interesting aspect of resource acquisition is that consortia offer an unusually visible avenue of entry into colleges by agencies with resources to use in particular ways. They may approach the consortium to initiate changes they can support simply because they don't know how to start with regular campus officials. In recent years there has been a growing institutional commitment by constitutent colleges to support their consortium's operating and program expenses. This is one of the strongest pieces of evidence attesting to the national success of consortia as perceived by the colleges themselves.

Precisely because most consortia seek and get financial support for

some of their programs may obscure the fact that they provide many resources at little or no cost. Expert knowledge, of great importance in institutional decision making, is often not available at a particular campus. The growth of cooperation within a consortium leads to an exchange of information at a very low cost that probably would have been absent. The calculus for social efficiency is inadequate to document the impact of such exchanges, but it is obvious that existing resources are used more fully than might otherwise be the case. This use of internal resources, in my estimation, is most important but receives the least attention.

Because of the need to share knowledge and other resources in the so-called "steady state" economy, a question of growing importance is going to be the degree of involvement of the consortium in institutional planning and control systems. One of the major problems for consortium directors is that they must make strategic decisions about long-term plans, while institutional staff are making day-to-day tactical decisions that may effectively prohibit adoption of cooperative solutions. Perhaps the greatest collective weakness of consortia is that they have only limited ability to monitor changes on campuses that may affect them.

Choosing the Solution

Once problems have been defined, choosing solutions is important not only in terms of selecting the best individual programs, but also in terms of their cumulative effect. The complexity of choosing programs is compounded by the fact that, before an agreement is reached, a number of decisions must be made by each campus. Different decision-making procedures, different priorities, and different time schedules among the consortium's institutions combine to make choosing very difficult.

The selection of people to identify solutions or to act on them is also difficult because once a group for examining a problem has been identified, the die is pretty well cast for many of the conclusions that will be reached. If the wrong people are chosen, the right solution will not surface to be selected.

What, then, does the consortium director bring to the choice of a solution that facilitates the change process? For a start, the director has the broadest insight into the impacts of possible solutions and can act to optimize these. Also, the director's role parallels very closely that of the fact-finding mediator in labor negotiations, who has no vested interest in the negotiations save a professional interest in seeing

that they do, in fact, proceed. He seeks grounds for conciliation and compromise and verifies that each of the parties is functioning on accurate information. The mediation that should take place horizontally among campuses is understood. That which takes places vertically within a campus is equally valuable, but far more difficult to bring off tactfully.

Another function of the consortium director that has its parallel in mediation is the breaking of standoffs. Colleges rarely have the same compulsory need for interaction that a labor union and a company have. Discussions on virtually anything can be broken off without directly related consequences. There is little need for proposals and counter-proposals. A consortium director, then, must be constantly on the look-out for new ideas and proposals that can become items for potential negotiation. To pursue the model a bit farther, one of the major weaknesses of the consortium relationship is the general lack of access any of the parties, especially the director, has to information about the other parties' flexibility on various items. The consortium can hardly offer alternative paths of action if the institution will not say what is acceptable to them. Similarly, the determination of trade-offs is impossible when each aspect of cooperation is negotiated by separate, independent, and uncoordinated representatives. If each college expects to move ahead on all fronts simultaneously, retrenchment in one field to permit advance in another is seldom possible. Over-all excellence and effectiveness can be undermined by reliance upon equality of reward.

Gaining Acceptance

Consortia are organizational anomalies in many ways, but one of the most striking is the overlay of redundant, often conflicting lines of communication and authority between senior institutional staff and others in the college structure. One set of lines passes up and down within the institution, and another more circuitous set detours through the consortium. When a proposal of any type is made, it will be run through both systems for response. Thus, acceptance of a program is typically not a small undertaking. And the occasions for misunderstanding and rejection increase with each institution in a consortium.

Even though a consortium may be receiving a fairly high level of interest and support from its members, a specific program may not be able to get institutional priority. Real acceptance is difficult to obtain because consortium priorities are not always institutional priorities. Here again, the consortium director has a very real role to play.

In addition to laying the groundwork needed to bring about an agreement to begin with, the director must follow the sales practice of continually reselling the product. People do forget, if they ever knew, why something happened and what's been done for them lately. They have to be given reasons for changes that may affect them personally as well as professionally. While a consortium director may see changes in terms of the benefits to the college or to the consortium, the person involved may see only the costs to himself. The follow-up required to implement actions is demanding, but it must be done.

The consortium director is a useful recipient of criticisms about the consortium and its specific programs. While one admissions officer or department chairperson won't complain to a peer, he will to the director. This negative feedback provides a necessary outlet for them, a chance to learn for the director, and a chance for the complainer to get personal explanations.

Despite the attention paid to consortium problems, it must be said that most consortia function with a fairly solid and genial base of support. When planning and discussion meetings are scheduled, institutional representatives generally do make an honest effort to find ways to cooperate. It must also be said that there are many good and valid reasons why cooperation ought not to be attempted in many situations and that not all failures are due to human perversity.

Stabilizing the Change

A recent book on NASA[3] put forth an intriguing concept that explains a key element of a healthy interorganizational arrangement. Because dysfunctions spring from many origins, the authors call for the adoption of "self-forcing/self-enforcing" systems. In the case of individual colleges, resource flows of students, courses, faculty, and money are handled by management systems that are often independent and highly impermeable. For a fairly large proportion of consortium programs, a self-forcing/self-enforcing system never emerges. Each faculty exchange may, for example, have its own almost unique developmental path from beginning to end. But it is very inefficient to constantly get departments to change their sequence of offerings or to accept new courses taught by outsiders through totally casual, non-repetitive methods. It is good to be open and

[3] Sayles, L. R., and Chandler, M. K., *Managing Large Systems: Organizations for the Future*. New York: Harper & Row, 1971, pp. 103-104.

flexible, but as the organizational theorist William R. Dill put it several years ago:

> There are times, though, when openness may be less of a problem than directions and priorities for organization effort. Even shelters without walls must be designed to stand on strong foundations.[4]

Peter Drucker put it more briefly: "Unless you enforce self-discipline, a good time is had by all—but that is all."[5] There are few consortium efforts that tie into existing systems and can be integrated with them easily. This has to change if the retreading of old ground is to stop.

This last step of the change process is one which each consortium confronts regularly, and it is here that most needs to be done. It is also a step which frequently requires a specific person to handle it. Often, the best self-forcing/self-enforcing system is simply a person hired to do the job. That's what led to formal consortia to begin with.

Conclusions

This paper has sketched out some facets of the role of consortia and consortium directors in the change process in higher education. In each of the six phases of change identified by Havelock, there are positive and negative potentialities for both inter- and intra-institutional changes embodied in the consortium approach. On balance, however, the constructive elements of consortia seem to outweigh the destructive elements. Unfortunately, there does not now appear to be a meaningful movement afoot to increase the potential effectiveness of consortia. Progress in the process of change through individual consortia has generally failed to move past "administration by emulation," as one director put it. The advances made are localized in impact. The outcomes of efforts at regionalism in several states can hardly be distinguished from consortium efforts.

How then can consortia be made more productive? If they can't be upgraded, the long-term prospects for their aiding in the solution of the really crucial problems confronting colleges and universities are not very bright. At the present time, we know very little about inter-institutional arrangements and their management. Cooperation as the basis for social organization represents an equally unknown quantity.

---

[4] Dill, W. R., "The Organization Man: Too Soon To Say Farewell." *Business Week*, June 5, 1971, pp. 21-24.

[5] Drucker, P. F., *Technology, Management and Society*. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

Getting beyond the "cottage industry" stage of development that most consortia are in today will not be easy, especially with the small amount of money available to support experimentation with different forms of cooperation.

What is needed is a substantial research and development effort among consortia to provide a solid base for managing such organizations. At a minimum, more action research should be undertaken to identify and take advantage of the rules of thumb we have now. Some time ago, an administrator was asked how he had acquired such good judgment. "Good experience," he said. "How do you get good experience?" was the next question. "Bad judgment," was the reply. A collective approach to learning from our experiences is needed, even when these experiences don't show up in the public relations pieces. Consortia could learn from one another far more than they do. Consortia should and will become more salient features of the higher education landscape, but their growth should represent progress and not merely expansion.

Perhaps a story will be useful to conclude and underscore this need for a reference point for progress. It seems that a well known string quartet found itself in a small town in Nebraska. After the quartet completed its concert, a little lady came up and exclaimed, "Why, that was the best recital I've ever heard. I'm sure that if you keep it up your little group will just grow and grow and grow!"

We don't need that kind of growth.

LIBRARY NETWORKS: WHAT TO EXPECT

Frederick G. Kilgour

There are a variety of types of library networks. One type is the cooperative computerized network. Networks consist of three, four, five, or even one hundred libraries, such as the Center for Research Libraries in Chicago. The latter is used largely to house little-used library material, thereby cutting the cost of storing duplicate copies of such materials. However, I shall speak only of the cooperative computerized network and shall focus on the Ohio College Library Center (OCLC) because it is most familiar to me.

Several other networks fit the description of a computerized cooperative. One is LIBRIS, a library information network operating in Sweden. It is a computer-based, cooperative arrangement among academic libraries for the most part, but also includes the Royal Library in Stockholm. The second, called BALLOTS, was developed for use in the Stanford University libraries, but the intention is to make it available to other libraries in the Bay Area. A third example is the system forthcoming among libraries in Ontario, Canada. Finally, there is the Ohio College Library Center.

Anyone confronted with the opportunity of joining one of these systems should ask certain questions. One is whether the network conforms to national and international standards. In the academic world we make uniformity, in its perjorative sense, sound relatively acceptable by calling it a standard. But when I talk of standards here, I am not speaking of rigid uniformity.

There are two principal standards to which the network must conform to merit consideration. First, its communication of machine-readable information should be in ASCII code which is both a national and an international standard. Second, its delivery of bibliographic information should conform to the standard for the communication of bibliographic information on magnetic tape. If one joins a network that meets these two standards and later shifts to another network, the same system of computer programs can be used.

On another level, there is the problem of the content of the

Frederick G. Kilgour is executive director of the Ohio College Library Center.

bibliographic record. The standard that applies here is the Anglo-American Cataloging Code.

Finally, before entering into a contractual relationship, one should be reasonably sure of the viability of the system. Unlike an academic librarian, the head of a network can make decisions that might result in the network going out of business. Furthermore, the Board of Trustees of a network can dissolve the corporation. Therefore, one must be more cautious when entering into contractual arrangements with such organizations. The viability judgment is the same kind of judgment that a site team makes when it visits an institution applying for a grant. The site team does not care what the buildings look like or what is in the laboratories, for the most part. They are primarily interested in the personnel and whether they can do the job. Whether negotiating with consortia or library networks, one's main concern should be: Can the personnel carry out the task as proposed?

Another question, intrinsic to the viability question, is financial stability. The financial stability of these networks may have to be defined differently from what is accepted in ordinary business. For instance, in OCLC right now, our debt-to equity ratio is three to one, which is too high for a profit-making business. But we are not a profit-making business. If OCLC had the opportunity to float a stock issue, it could change that relationship rapidly. Bankers do not understand or like this high debt-to-equity ratio.

One must deal with the fact that, as a business organization, a network's financial statement is not going to be stable. Where will it get its risk capital? A cooperative network obtains risk capital in somewhat different ways than a university or college, and certainly in different ways than a business. Most of the risk capital is supplied by the manufacturers of equipment that is leased with an option to purchase or is purchased on an installment purchase plan. This is not standard procedure. A network's position vis-a-vis risk capital is one standard for judging whether it is a viable organization.

Another aspect to consider is the effectiveness of a network's research and development program. What are the people engaged in research and development really achieving? What these networks are doing, and what consortia are doing, or should do to some extent, is to open up new areas that need exploration, research, and development. Most of the new areas of knowledge in which library networks of the type referred to here operate are a virtual wilderness. There is a lot of research to be undertaken to secure the information needed to bring about new development.

Finally, the problem of governance must be raised. To what extent are members of the network able to participate in governance? Does it matter if members don't participate in the governance? The Ohio College Library Center and the other networks are not mere services; they are performing a function for libraries. However, they also do something *to* libraries. Presumably a consortium is similar in effect. The crucial question is, What does one need to know to determine the effect that a contractual relationship is going to have? And, how does one get that information? These are important points to consider.

Having identified the major questions and guidelines for deciding on membership in a library network, I turn now to the Ohio College Library Center, the largest of these networks. Briefly, it is a not-for-profit corporation that consists of institutions in Ohio that hold exemption under the Internal Revenue Service Code, Section 501 (c) (3). Institutions may join the network by paying a membership fee based on the extent to which they will use the system in the production of catalogs. This group elects trustees who have the same responsibilities and authority as the Board of Trustees of a college. Recently the OCLC Board of Trustees asked that the regions in which the Center has agreements appoint seven representatives to attend trustees' meetings. These representatives do not vote but they participate in the process by which tough and responsible decisions are made by the trustees.

From the technical point of view, the system consists of a computer, with a large secondary memory, in Columbus, Ohio. It has six telephone lines and an average of 30 cathode ray tube terminals on each line. In other words, at the present time there are about 180 terminals operating on this system. These form a triangle from western Ohio to Waterville, Maine, to Atlanta, Georgia. By the end of May 1974, it will extend to Texas and shortly thereafter to New Mexico. The amount of activity averages just under 6,000 books a day being cataloged on this system. Some consortia represented in this audience include libraries in which no member catalogs that many books in a year.

The secondary memories that house the bibliographic records had 828,000 machine-readable catalog records available in early March 1974. They are available within ten seconds most of the time, no matter what access route is used. If a number access is used, the result is usually on the screen within six seconds for any one of those 828,000 records. The location of each type of book cataloged is

automatically recorded so that there is an on-line catalog for the institution and an on-line union catalog of the resources of all the participating libraries. In early March, there were 1,714,000 location listings available on-line. In addition, the system produces about 40,000 catalog cards a day for the 6,000 books processed. The finished cards are produced according to the format requested by each individual institution, in packs ready to be filed in specific catalogs in specific institutions.

What are OCLC's objectives? The important thing about the objectives of this kind of system is that they cannot be achieved by the individual institutions. There is no point to a library network that mimics the classical objectives of classical librarianship. The same point can be made for consortia and academic institutions. The primary purpose of consortia and networks should be new objectives that individual institutions cannot have.

The first and major objective is to make the resources of participating libraries available to individual users in the individual institutions, obviously something which an individual library cannot do. No individual library can produce 1,714,000 location records and maintain a growth rate of 120,000 a month. A network has the opportunity to make resources available, and to eliminate the duplication of expensive resources in participating institutions.

OCLC also makes bibliographical information available to catalogers when and where they need it, something else that an individual library cannot do. One of the characteristics of a library card catalog is that there is only one of the wretched things. If a user wants to consult it, he must go to the library. An excellent example of making a catalog available to users when and where they need it is the remote catalog access and circulation system at the Ohio State University Libraries. This system eliminates the need to go to the OSU library. As a member of the OSU faculty, I can pick up a telephone, dial a person at a CRT terminal, and, by giving the author's name and the first word of the title, I find out whether or not OSU has a particular book. If it does and if it is not charged out, the book is on my desk within a day or two. This remarkable service is available to students, staff, and faculty alike.

Professional librarians become just as frustrated with library service as anybody else does. Whereas I will not spend half a day going to a library to discover that I cannot obtain what I want, I am entirely prepared to spend half a minute not to get what I want! Half of the time, I do get what I want, and my personal use of the

books has doubled or tripled since OSU implemented its remote catalog access system.

Librarians, of whom I am one, claim that the objective of libraries is service. However, service is no longer enough, even if libraries were doing what the term implies. For too long, service has meant opening and closing the library door when it is convenient for the librarian, and allowing people to use the place on his terms. This concept must change. In other words, a library must participate actively in the education and research programs within the institution; it should not settle for passive service.

Finally, the new library systems must become personalized libraries. The only really personalized library is the one in which the librarian knows the collection, knows the individual people who are using it, and can bring the two together. But in library literature, we never talk about individual students. We talk about "users," "patrons," "members of the community," and other depersonalized clients. Every library user knows that a library is a monolithic arrangement of books that doesn't change one whit when the user walks into it. The user must conform to the library because catalogs and the arrangements of books on shelves cannot adjust to the user. A computer network can and must repersonalize the library.

One of the many things that a computer can do is to treat an individual person as an individual person, an individual event as an individual event, or an individual book as an individual book. Indeed, the OCLC data base has nothing in it that remotely resembles a simple, classical library catalog, and yet, when someone requests a catalog, the system produces a small catalog in seconds having perhaps from one to ten entries in it, saying, in effect, that the item requested is in this little catalog. Furthermore, 90 percent of the time that catalog has perhaps 20 or fewer entries in it so that the user is not confronted with those boxcars of cards that are out front in a university library. A computerized library network can produce a small, personalized catalog.

The objectives discussed so far are subsidary to the first one, that is, making resources available. Now we turn to costs. The second major objective for academic institutions is to lower the rate of increase in per-student costs. This deceleration of cost rise is essential to networks and to consortia as well. It has been an urgent need for half-a-dozen years since it was established that the rate of rise in per-student costs in academe was 7½ percent annually.

More recently, William J. Baumol and Matityahu Marcus pub-

lished a book entitled *The Economics of the Academic Libraries* (American Council on Education, 1973). It should be required reading for anyone considering involvement in a network. The book is a basic statement about the economics of academic libraries revealing that in the 1950's and 1960's the annual increase in per-student cost was over 6 percent as compared with the rise of the general price index of 1 percent. The reason for this disparity in libraries as in the whole of academe is that no technology has been applied to increase the productivity of library staff members. To remedy this situation is one of the main aims of cooperative computerized networks.

The effectiveness of OCLC's efforts to increase staff productivity will be included in a forthcoming report to the Ohio Board of Regents which helped OCLC get started by awarding the Center a two-year partial subsidy that enabled member libraries to convert from manual systems to the computer system. The budgeted cost of the system to Ohio institutions in 1973-74 was $598,000. A study revealed that the savings realized through the reduction of cataloging activity was $591,000. However, the actual savings was probably at least 20 percent higher, reflecting a net savings of at least 10 percent. It is clear that the rate rise of per-student costs is being decelerated dramatically. As a matter of fact, the institutions that are using the system in the most beneficial way are not just reducing the rate of rise of cost but are actually making net savings. At one institution, for example, 17 positions have been eliminated from the library, while its cataloging production was rising from 26,000 to 37,000 volumes. It is making a net savings in the tens of thousands of dollars by using this system.

Finally, we have the opportunity to provide management information and more efficient procedures to libraries, although this is not an objective unique to this kind of network. We have six subsystems that we intend to implement. One is already operating, the system called on-line union catalog and shared cataloging discussed in previous paragraphs.

Next is a serials control system that is being developed. The first module is now in operation at one library. It will have an on-line union catalog of serials. There are 130,000 serial subscriptions in Ohio academic libraries at the present time, and by eliminating 10 percent of them that are unused and duplicates, it is reasonable to predict that large savings will accrue from this on-line catalog. If a

cost of $10 per subscription is assumed, savings amount to $130,000 a year, every year.

Another subsystem being developed is an acquisitions system to be followed by on-line remote catalog access and circulation control such as the Ohio State University arrangement, subject access for users, and an interlibrary loan request system.

The reliability of this system is one basis for making an assessment. Recently, a visitor inquired about hardware failure. In the previous three weeks the hardware was down fifteen minutes one week and had lost no time; it operates twelve hours daily. The computer programs are highly complex but stable; they cause little down time. It is a rare week when the system is not up 98 percent of the time. The system is lowering the rate of rise of per-unit costs; it is cost beneficient. The union catalog works; there is at least one library that finds two-thirds of the materials that it is looking for in our union catalog. In short, the major objectives of the system have already been achieved.

HIGHER EDUCATION MANAGEMENT: AN OPPORTUNITY FOR CONSORTIA

Donald Shaner

Donald Shaner and Associates, Inc., is a three-year-old firm of general management consultants who specialize in improving the management of higher education. We seek to apply to higher education the same principles of management that have been successful for many years in business. By "management" we mean a process which includes the integrated development of objectives, plans, programs and controls necessary to accomplish all human endeavor. Our firm has directed management improvement studies of the public systems of higher education for legislatures in the states of Ohio, Oregon, and recently, a study of 56 colleges and universities for the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Two problems dominate our findings. First, higher education, and particularly public higher education, is not well managed. Thus neither maximum quantity, economy, nor quality of education is obtained from the resources involved. Second, educators are not leading—rather they are following—at the national, state and institutional levels.

The conditions that nurtured these problems are familiar to the educational community. Until recently there has been a massive and continuing growth of enrollments caused by greater population and the increased percentage of youth seeking higher education. Many small schools suddenly became large at this time, but still employed the management practices of a small school. In addition, private schools could not maintain their traditional percentage of enrollments in this period of growth due to lack of capital and operating funds. This threw an even heavier load on the public system.

Despite a crucial need for good management, it was neglected. Presidents, who are necessarily educators and often good fund developers, were unreasonably expected to be experienced managers in highly unstable, complex conditions. Even many board members, experts in corporate management, failed to apply their expertise, caught up as they were with beleaguered presidents in the philosophy and value of education in its moment of crisis.

Donald Shaner is president of Donald Shaner and Associates, Inc.

The objective of our studies of state systems is to improve the effectiveness of management and reduce the cost of operation without impairing quality of education. We begin a study with the legislature and the office of the governor, extend through the various boards of regents of higher education and into the individual colleges and universities. In our approach we review the management of each institution comprising the system in terms of planning, financial management and control, space utilization, data processing and systems, personnel management, physical plant operations, and library operations. With these findings, we can evaluate the management needs of the system as a whole and determine whether appropriate management is applied at the state level.

Deficiencies at the Institutional Level

Planning is the weakest link in the whole field of higher education. Lack of planning is the reason we unexpectedly found thousands of people trained as teachers who could not find a job. There was a gross surplus all over the country and, for the same reason, a lack of planning. The disturbing fact about looking out the window and seeing too many teachers or too many people with doctorates is that these are only the more obvious signs of the lack of planning.

Our review of 56 colleges and universities has failed to turn up what we would term a comprehensive plan guiding the development of an institution. A comprehensive plan is one that is based upon research which forecasts the developments in technology and knowledge, and the needs of society for the next ten to twenty years. It includes an academic plan reflecting the changes in curriculum and development of faculty required to meet these needs, and a non-academic plan encompassing activities that facilitate the academic plan, such as accounting operations, data processing and systems activities, purchasing functions, feeding operations, as well as maintenance and other activities. The academic and non-academic plans must be translated into operational financial requirements on an annual basis. Faculty requirements must be determined, and a capital plan developed.

Unfortunately, when we ask to see the master plan for an institution, we often are taken to a room having one wall covered with a multicolored map of the campus showing where the next science building will be located. But when we ask what is behind the need for the next science building, the support is thin.

Our work has been entirely with public systems of higher educa-

tion, and within these systems we find such planning not only absent at the institutional level but at the state level as well, with little guidance nationally. This does not mean that there are not knowledgeable people at the state level who could accomplish such work. It does mean that these people do not have sufficient authority; therefore, planning is not done except on a superficial basis. We often find an institutional research function concerned primarily with ad hoc data and information studies, but we seldom find a planning function with a comprehensive mission.

This is disappointing to the general public, who look to educators as leaders. Who should be better equipped to propose the means by which man can better serve the needs of society than the experts, the educators? But how can educators lead unless they look to the future in a comprehensive fashion? I will never forget the experience of listening to the president of a major university describe his fund-raising success in which many millions of dollars had been garnered for the construction of a number of new buildings. When I asked to see his financial plan depicting his capability for staffing the facilities academically and non-academically, he had none. Worse yet, it took half an hour for him to understand the need for such a plan.

We have also found many deficiencies in the area of financial management and control. Too often, budgets are used merely as fund allocating devices and not as part of a financial plan; management control is weakened by failure to plan budgets on a monthly basis; there is little or no review of officer and manager performance; and auxiliary operations have no profit and loss statements. Most current institutional accounting procedures do not serve the information needs of management. Even though coordination of accounting functions could represent a major cost reduction in many schools, we often find these functions scattered over different departments that have established them in desperation. Management of endowment funds is also naive. Insufficient auditing of the fund is common, with the resulting opportunity for fraud. We have never found any institution in which the slightest hint of fraud existed, or anything that caused us to question the honesty of the people handling these funds; however, mismanagement places an unnecessary burden upon the individual, and sometimes a mere error will cause a scandal of great and unnecessary proportions. The president and the board are responsible for such deficiencies.

Space utilization is another complex problem on any campus. It

involves simultaneous consideration of the number of students and the courses they want, classroom availability and size, faculty availability and capability, and course sequential relationships. It is normally handled in the registrar's office. More frequently, now, we are finding it assisted by computerized systems of registration and sectioning.

Through space utilization measurement and control, it is possible to manage the major portion of an institution's capital assets. However, in most public systems, if measurement and standards exist, they are used as a means of obtaining a new building, not in management control. We have never found a school in which there is close communication between those who plan and provide space and those who manage the use of space. Thus, comprehensive knowledge of the need for space (type and size of room, student stations, location, time of day) is not supplied by those most knowledgeable, and planners tend to repeat the mistakes of the past. High levels of space utilization are not achieved because the standards of the past assume that new construction is necessary before high utilization can result. Most campuses are overbuilt for the same reasons—nationally, by more than 25 percent and in the case of one state system by almost 67 percent.

No long-range plans guide the development of data processing systems and computers on campus, and interinstitutional planning is rare. As a result, we have found neighboring institutions developing independent systems even where there is a common need and despite the greater capability and economy of a network. In addition, so far there has been only limited application of the computer and other technology to the teaching process. Given this situation, it is not surprising that institutions complain that data processing and systems never reduce staffing requirements.

Technology has been called the sleeping giant in education, and I believe it is. But once it awakens, what a fantastic cost will result if, as in all other developments, each school proceeds independently.

Personnel management in public colleges and universities usually consists of little more than complying with the ritualistic requirements of the state's civil service system. We have never found a comprehensive personnel office. It serves primarily the hourly or lower-level supervisory employees. Therefore, much of its value as a management tool is lost. Common deficiencies include wage and salary administration, management and organization development, executive recruitment, exit interviews as part of a program to reduce

turnover of employees, and employee and supervisory training programs. Institutions have failed to realize the cost benefits achieved by reducing employee turnover and have neglected the training needs of their more responsible managers and officers.

Out of 56 colleges and universities we have found only two or three with sufficient controls to manage physical plant operations intelligently. The absence of organized systems of planning, scheduling and controling maintenance activities, and well-developed concepts of work measurement and preventive maintenance is common. Excessively high costs are a result of the failure to apply systems of janitorial management. Fragmentation of the organization into separate janitorial or maintenance organizations in several divisions (dormitories, student union and physical plant) eliminates the possibility of volume savings.

Libraries are another area of poor management. Institutions often fail to include librarians in the academic planning process. As a result, academic programs do not receive the full benefit of existing library resources, nor do librarians fully understand academic requirements. Some librarians have abdicated academic and institutional responsibility by indiscriminate reliance on jobbers offering book approval plans. Frequency of book use is unrelated to storage methods and computerized systems have not been applied agressively to management of acquisitions and processing. Low cost and poor service are so nearly equated that common procedures of purchasing management are ignored. So, despite the universal lament about the high cost of books, the need to accommodate an information explosion, and processing costs and space requirements, there is still an extreme reluctance to enter into meaningful, cooperative, resource sharing.

Deficiencies at the State Level

At the state level we often find inadequate or inappropriate authority to provide coordinated development of the public system of higher education. In some states the coordinating or advisory authority is so weak that a system of public higher education does not exist. In one state, the Board was so engulfed in administrative detail that institutions exercised almost complete autonomy of management. When a coordinating body has insufficient authority, it must achieve a consensus among the institutions. Difficult problems tend to be avoided. No one assumes an educational leadership role, and the long-range needs of society are not broadly determined. Institutions

continue to be self-serving—a prerogative the public schools do not have. Within such a void, the state cannot address private higher education in a substantive way. The interests of private higher education can be adversely affected inadvertently by the lack of a position at the state level.

Opportunity for Consortia

What can be done about the many management problems which exist in higher education and what role do consortia play? Our recommendations for solving these management problems are aimed at changing the responsibility and authority of the state level educational agency. In general, we recommend that the state agency receive broad powers in the areas of planning and finance and that it adopt high-level management policy. In addition, we normally recommend formation of involuntary consortia. Although our work in public systems has dealt with functions which should be served by involuntary consortia, there is no reason voluntary consortia serving private schools cannot apply the same mechanism to the solution of their management problems.

In particular, we have proposed that the state level educational agency be responsible for developing and providing institutional services such as

- Computer networks and computerized administrative systems for accounting, budgeting, admissions, registration, space utilization, payroll, management information, and libraries;
- And training programs for new board members and management personnel in many areas including maintenance, purchasing, food service, book store, library, program planning and budgeting systems, and personnel.

Since private institutions of higher education are generally much harder pressed financially than the public colleges and universities, there is even more reason for them to form consortia to achieve the benefits of common programs, systems, and services. However, there is no valid reason why the programs developed for public institutions could not also serve private schools at a considerable saving. Further, I believe consortia offer the only practical means for state level coordination of planning for both public and private higher education.

Though we never considered the possibility in our studies, it is reasonable that there should be a hierarchy of consortia addressing all of higher education nationally which would provide a basis for educational leadership. It would

- Plan studies to make the same kind of assessment nationally that we indicated was necessary at the state level;
- Examine the long range educational needs of society based upon a forecast of developments in technology and knowledge;
- And take an inventory of program offerings of public and private education to document the voids and excesses and need for change.

With this kind of knowledge, institutions would be less apt to waste resources as they did in the case of teacher education and many doctoral fields, and as they may do in law, if reason does not prevail. With this information a consortium of public and private colleges in each state could plan intelligently.

The list of potential objects of consortium action is endless. It must include academic programs and joint uses of facilities. The opportunity is vast and consortia offer the single realistic device for practical coordination of all of higher education, public and private, at both the national and state levels.

FINANCING HIGHER EDUCATION IN PENNSYLVANIA

J. G. K. Miller

This is a brief report on a comprehensive proposal for financing higher education in Pennsylvania. This proposal was presented to Governor Shapp on January 16. Interestingly and symbolically, at the presentation the *public school* president, Dr. Oswald from Penn State. spoke in support of state aid for private schools. The *private school* president, Dr. Eddy from Chatham College, advocated maintaining, but not raising, the already high tuition at public schools.

That is the key point in the proposal—it *does* represent a consensus. The public and private sectors are united in support of it and it is comprehensive.

This effort was pulled together by the statewide association, the Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Universities, commonly called PACU. The essential work was done by a committee of the presidents themselves, assisted by a drafting and editing committee. Consortia in the state were interested but not involved. The agreement on the package was finally hammered out at the annual convention of the 117 member institutions of PACU that met in Pittsburgh last fall.

Before I sketch a few of the salient provisions of the proposal, I should describe the Pennsylvania academic scene briefly. Generally, our system of higher education looks like this:

- There are 14 state-owned colleges. (Slippery Rock is the best known nationally for its football team.) These colleges enroll 75,000 students at a tuition of $760 per year.
- There are three state-related universities—Pitt, Penn State, and Temple—which enroll 125,000 students at a tuition of about $1,000 per year.
- We have 14 community colleges—all two-year—enrolling over 50,000 students and growing fast. Tuition runs $400 per year.
- There are 120 independent colleges and universities enrolling 170,000 students, 42 percent of the total in the state. These are very

---

J. G. K. Miller is executive director of the Pittsburgh Council on Higher Education.

diverse institutions. Tuitions vary widely but most are in the $2,200 to $2,900 range.

In the area of student aid, the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency (PHEAA) is a model and it is well funded. Sixty-four million dollars in state funds is allocated on the basis of need to students from families whose income is not over $15,000. The choice of school is up to the student; in fact, a grant of up to $800 may be awarded even though the Pennsylvania student elects to attend school in another state. A grant may be as high as $1,200 in-state, but ~~not over~~ one-half of the student's budget.

Within this setting, the comprehensive financing proposal was designed to put students first and to assist in equitable access to higher education programs. However, drafters did note that the federal government has shifted almost exclusively to providing direct student aid. Accordingly, the proposal recommended that the state should also consider needs of institutions in order to keep the system together and retain diversity.

The proposal made major recommendations in the areas of student aid, institutional aid and tuition. To help students it would

- Increase the maximum grant from $1,200 to $2,000.
- Raise the family income ceiling from $15,000 to $20,000. This would allow some modest aid for middle income families.
- Attempt to establish reciprocity with neighboring states concerning grants for students who cross state lines.

To help institutions it would

- Permit advanced authorization and "forward funding" for appropriations, both for the institutions and the student grant program. Priority in public funding would continue to go to public institutions
- Remove legal restrictions on community college subsidies and raise the legal limit on expensive vocational programs.
- Provide an institutional assistance grant of $600 per student to the independent institution in which a PHEAA grant recipient enrolls. This is a student-following grant which compensates private schools for part of the cost of instruction of these grant recipients.
- Initiate a system of contracts to enable private institution capacity to be used when the public sector is fully utilized.

Finally, the proposal makes recommendations concerning tuition:

- At public schools the tuition should stay where it is. The present rate is among the nation's highest and it covers about half the cost of instruction, which was the objective of the Committee on Economic Development.

• At private schools there should be efforts to control tuition. The report recognizes the current effort and hopes that the proposal grants and contracts will assist.

To summarize, this is a comprehensive plan which has the support of public and private higher education in Pennsylvania. Hopefully, it will be given careful consideration by the review authorities and will find its way into law and appropriations.

MAKING STATES MORE RESPONSIVE TO POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Richard M. Millard

In March of this year, Commissioner of Education John R. Ottina sent a letter to the governors of all the states inviting them to establish "broadly and equitably representative" 1202 postsecondary commissions. This action is important because it leaves up to the governors what particular forms the commissions in the various states will take. But it is more important for its recognition of the postsecondary universe which includes but is not limited to higher education. This new, or newly defined, concept makes new demands on those agencies responsible for postsecondary education. I would like to discuss here three efforts by the Education Commission of the States (ECS) to help meet these demands at the state level.

The first of these efforts is the ECS Task Force on Coordination, Governance and Structure. The task force grew out of a series of things: an earlier report of a Task Force on Comprehensive Planning for Postsecondary Education in 1971; a very important document from the American Association of State Colleges and Universities called "Institutional Rights and Responsibilities"; and discussions about the pending 1202 commissions.

There are 47 states which have some form of coordination or governance of their total higher education community. Many are currently undergoing re-evaluation. For this reason the task force thought it important to refrain from developing a specific model of coordination and to concentrate on the issues and elements involved in developing effective coordination and planning. Implied in this decision is the recognition that each of the 50 states is, in fact, different, and what might work in one state may not work at all in another.

Last fall the task force published a report called "Coordination or Chaos?" The report begins by pointing out that, historically, states have had major responsibility for postsecondary and higher education. While the report of the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education contends that the federal contribution is

Richard M. Millard is director of Higher Education Services with the Education Commission of the States.

equal to state support of higher education, a large part of federal support is for categorical projects and research activities. Although these activities are important, they do not constitute the bread and butter on which higher education lives. Such direct support is supplied by the states. Accordingly, the task force report points out that the responsibility for the general welfare of postsecondary and higher education is primarily a state responsibility. At this time state responsibility needs to be further developed to assure real diversity in higher education, with recognition of the importance of the role of private higher education in the total postsecondary education enterprise.

The report also points out that there is no one formula for budget review at the state level. Each state must develop appropriate forms for budget review and evaluation by coordinating its statewide structures. The report stresses that planning must go before coordination and not vice versa. Coordination for its own sake is bureaucratic. But coordination as an integral part of planning that leads to the clear differentiation of levels of decision making, and to recognition of role and scope, is essential if we are to preserve the diversity that has made postsecondary education in this country as effective as it has been. It is essential, moreover, if we are to make higher education available to citizens of all ages.

Thus, the report suggests that the states have an obligation to assure the diversity essential for effective operation. State planning should include a clear definition of objective, role and scope of the various institutions, worked out with the institutions themselves. It also suggests that such planning must allow institutions to exercise autonomy and flexibility in realizing their goals.

The report identifies the consortium movement as an integral part of effective planning at both institutional and state levels. It states, "New means should be explored to encourage voluntary interinstitutional cooperation and complementation, in addition to or as reinforcement of state-wide planning and coordination." The report may well constitute an important antidote to other reports that have appeared recently which recommend open competition. Such open and unrestricted competition, by reducing credibility even further and affecting the students' education adversely, would be disastrous to the higher education community.

The second ECS effort is related to the first in some respects. The Education Commission of the States has been fortunate in being awarded a Kellogg Foundation grant of about $600,000 towards a $900,000 Inservice Education Program for State Higher Education

Agency Personnel, Board Members and Related State Officials. In the broadest sense, the intention of the program is to help create a level of understanding among the various state agencies involved in planning and coordination, and among those concerned state officials. Specifically, the purpose of the program is to share information, orient new personnel, and increase knowledge, ability, and competence of staff members of statewide postsecondary and higher education coordinating and governing agencies including commission and board members. The program will provide seminars, short courses, and other in-service educational activities for statewide postsecondary education coordinating and governing agency personnel and for other state officials who have direct or indirect responsibility for state post-secondary education planning, budgeting and coordination. The proposal itself was worked out cooperatively by the State Higher Education Executive Officers, the Education Commission of the States, and three university centers: the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at the University of California at Berkeley, the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Michigan, and the University of Florida/Florida State University Center for Regional Leadership.

Evidence provides convincing reasons for this program and its potential. By the end of the 1960's, some 47 states had statewide agencies, including 20 governing boards and 27 coordinating agencies. These vary in scope, power and size but in almost every case they are at least charged with some degree of planning, budget review, and program and degree approval. The staff members for these agencies have had backgrounds in education or in education and politics. The level of staff and staff resources varies considerably from state to state. There are problems in terms of replacement. Members have had to pioneer in the development of appropriate modes of operation. Demands are increasing for more accurate information systems, more adequate and effective approaches to planning, use and development of output measures, and effective program evaluation.

Added to this is a new emphasis on the planning operation in postsecondary education. Thus, while the State Higher Education Executive Officers and the Education Commission of the States serve as clearinghouses for information, they have recognized the need for a more systematic approach to in-service education and sharing among agencies, agency staff, board members and other related state officials. As problems and needs increased, these staffs have become more diversified in many states. In many cases officers for state

planning, programs, and student assistance have become expert in their own fields. However, it is crucial that they have a feel for and an understanding of the range of problems with which others must deal in coordination, governance and planning. Yet increasing responsibilities reduce the possibility of extended learning periods for staff. In addition, the boards in almost every state are made up of laymen who are highly knowledgeable in their own fields but may require orientation to deal effectively with higher education.

The proposed program includes orientation seminars for new board members as well as seminars on specific topics for staff members. Eventually, the trustees, directors, and staffs of state colleges, community colleges and other institutions will be included in such seminars. The program will offer a series of six or seven seminars or institutes per year, each lasting from three to five days. At least one or two of these each year will be general orientation seminars and the others will be special problem seminars on topics such as master planning and legal aspects of coordination and planning.

The organization of the program consists of a planning board, an advisory council, and a director. The planning board also functions as a board of governors for the program. Its members have primary responsibility for developing priorities and for program development. The advisory council will represent a cross section of potential users. One unique aspect of the program is that it works with the university centers across the country on program development, using their resources as well as resources of the states and the agencies.

This program has tremendous potential in many areas. One is improving the competencies of state higher education agency personnel. A second is increasing understanding among board members, staffs and agencies. A third is the possibility of a new type of cooperation and understanding. I am very hopeful that these will be some of the results.

The final area of ECS activity which I would like to mention briefly is consumer protection in postsecondary education and state regulatory responsibility in the approval of new institutions and authority to grant degrees. The Education Commission of the States is developing model legislation in this area, not with the hope that each state will adopt it in its entirety, but as a means of at least identifying the issues that need to be faced by state regulatory agencies.

Hopefully, these three efforts, along with others, will improve the responsiveness of state postsecondary agencies and encourage co-

operation between state agencies and voluntary consortia. I am pleased by the growth of understanding and cooperation so far. It springs from the recognition by state agencies, governors and legislators, statewide planning commissions, and consortia that we are together in the world of postsecondary education whether we want to be or not, and that the emphasis must be placed on complementation, not contrast.

AAHE COOPERATIVE PROGRAM PUBLICATIONS

Acquainter—*A newsletter published ten times a year. Reports on consortium developments, new cooperatives, legislation, funding, research and meetings. AAHE members $8, others $12.*

1974-75 Consortium Directory—*Annual listing of names, addresses, phone numbers and administrative officers of over 80 consortia, along with program descriptions and new sections on geographical location, funding and make-up of each organization. Published in September 1974. AAHE members $3, others $5.*

1974-75 Guide to Interinstitutional Arrangements: Voluntary and Statutory—*Reference information on all types of cooperative arrangements: single-purpose, bilaterals, library networks, statewide boards, etc. Published in fall 1974. AAHE members $3, others $5.*

Trends and Issues in Cooperation, Fall—*Major speeches and small group reports from the most recent fall Cooperative Program Seminar. AAHE members $2, others $4.*

Trends and Issues in Cooperation, Spring—*Speeches and small group reports from the most recent spring Cooperative Program Seminar in Chicago. AAHE members $2, others $4.*

A subscription to the entire package of publications listed above costs $15 for AAHE members, $25 for others. To order the package or individual copies of any of the publications, write to Cooperative Program Publications, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D.C. 20036. Payment must accompany all orders under $15.